

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**RONALD CAMBREL,**

**Petitioner**

**v.**

**ISAAC FULWOOD, et al.,**

**Respondents**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**CIVIL NO. 3:CV-09-1930**

**(Judge Caputo)**

**O R D E R**

**THE BACKGROUND OF THIS ORDER IS AS FOLLOWS:**

Presently before the Court on Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's denial of his motion to stay his other habeas proceedings during the pendency of his present mandamus action. See Doc. 7, Mot. for Recons. Specifically, Mr. Cambrel sought the Court to stay further proceedings in his habeas action which challenged the United States Parole Commission's (Parole Commission) repeated denials of parole. See [Cambrel v. Warden Bryan Bledsoe, 3:CV-08-1684, 2011 WL 3439199 \(M.D. Pa. Aug. 5, 2011\)](#). His present action is one founded in mandamus and seeks the forced disclosure of records relied upon by the Parole Commission in his parole proceedings. Doc. 1, Pet. for Writ of Mandamus. On August 23, 2010, we denied Petitioner's request to stay his habeas proceedings (filed in this case) challenging the denial of parole based. Doc. 6. Petitioner then filed a motion for reconsideration of that order. Doc. 7.

The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence." [Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779](#)

F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985); see *Max's Seafood Café by Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999) (explaining that party seeking reconsideration must show intervening change in controlling law, availability of new evidence, or need to correct clear error of law or fact or to prevent manifest injustice). Petitioner's motion for reconsideration does not present any arguments not previously presented in his original motion. Moreover, on August 5, 2011, this Court dismissed Petitioner's habeas action challenging the Parole Commission's repeated denials of parole. See *Cambrel v. Warden Bryan Bledsoe*, 3:CV-08-1684, 2011 WL 3439199 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 5, 2011). As such, Mr. Cambrel's request for reconsideration is moot as we cannot stay a closed case.

**ACCORDINGLY, THIS 3rd DAY OF OCTOBER, 2011, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** Mr. Cambrel's Motion for Reconsideration (doc. 7) is **DENIED as MOOT.**

---

**/s/ A. Richard Caputo**  
**A. RICHARD CAPUTO**  
**United States District Judge**